# AIM

THE BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN INDEPENDENT MOVEMENT

Published by the Independent Political Action Committee — Volume I, Number 8; Tuesday August 16, 1966


# THOUSANDS RALLY AT POWDER HILL

August 6, 1966:

On the 21st anniversary of the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima, between 2000 and 3000 people met at Powder Hill, Middlefield, Connecticut with 13 peace candidates from the Atlantic Northeast and Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon, drawn together by the impending specter of infinitely greater Hiroshimas resulting from President Johnson's foreign policy madness. The mood of the day was set early by Ossie Davis, the Negro actor and playwright, who told the afternoon audience: I'm not running for political office. I'm running for my life.

The afternoon sun shone so intensely on the New England-New York Conference for a New Politics that none of the daytime speakers was tempted to speak at length. The candidates disagreed on whether the weather was proof that "someone is on our side" or "a devious plot by our opponents to give us all sunstroke."

The day opened with four workshops, including one led by Bob Cook which discussed how the "new politics" in Connecticut was developing. Paul Booth of SDS and Adam Schesch of the National Co-ordinating Committee to End the War in Viet-Nam also led workshops. Following are highlight excerpts from the afternoon comments by the candidates.

Eugene Daniel (Dem. primary--N.H.): We must make this war politically disastrous for those in office today. Falsehood and deceit got us into this war and falsehood and deceit are keeping us in it. I was proud to fight against the Nazis.

Cont. -- Next Page

## POWDER HILL SPEECHES

### Robert Cook

The war in Viet-Nam is wrong -- wrong in so many ways that it seems foolish to single out any one of them for special treatment. We are brutally attacking the people of that country with such overwhelming force that the war has been called one of the most barbarous in history. We are setting the stage for a full-scale land war in Asia. We are subverting international law, and our own as well. We are squander-

Cont. -- Next Page

### Senator Wayne Morse

The value of this meeting is in bringing together Americans who are not content to leave to the traditional political mechanism and sloganeering the fate of the American people and much of the world.

The hardening of the American position in Southeast Asia has gone hand in glove with the hardening of the slogans used to justify our intervention there. The one breeds the other, for as a new venture is undertaken

Continued, page 3

AIM

Editorial Staff
John Sinisi
Elizabeth Berliner
The campaign publication of the Independent Political Action Committee will be published every two weeks. Letters to the editor are invited. Please keep them short and send them to
AIM Editor
IPAC
241 Orange Street
New Haven.
Individuals or groups not now receiving AIM are invited to add their names to our mailing list. Write to the editor or call 787-0123.

# NEWSLETTER NEEDS HELP

Come September, one of AIM's editors will be in Japan, another at Columbia University, and the third bogged down in studies. Therefore AIM desperately needs at least 2 people willing and able to take over editorial responsibility. If you have the time don't be humble, volunteer. People with an artistic bent, or who can use scissors and paste, are needed to help with the layout (otherwise known as the paste-up). Volunteers for either job should contact Liz Berliner at 777-1346.

# rally - cont.

I don't want to fight a war to defend some cheap Quisling by the name of Ky.

Theodore Weiss (lost the Dem. primary in N.Y.'s 19th District by 151 votes in an election marked by such wide-spread fraud that a re-run of the primary has been ordered by the courts): Whether I won by 60 or lost by 151 votes the President cannot claim he is being supported by an overwhelming majority in Manhattan's 19th District.

Dr. David Frost (Dem. primary, Senate--N.J.): We have given the Viet Cong the opportunity for being the sole spokesmen of the oppressed in Viet-Nam. We must learn that we cannot dictate the form of government that other countries can have.

Stephen Minot (AIM candidate in Conn., 6th District): I am sick of Texas-type national piety. I am sick of a Republican party that tells its candidates not to speak about the war until they know which way the votes lie. I am sick of Democratic candidates who say "I am against World War III. Now vote for me I'm a liberal."

Fred Harris (of New Haven's Hill Parents' Association): It is the minority peoples who are fighting this war and suffering the most from it. The struggle of these peoples for decency and equality depend on an end to the war.

Thomas Boyleston Adams (Dem. primary, Senate--Mass.): Each step in the escalation of the war has been a denial of the justification of the last escalation of the war. The purpose of the war is now clear. Establishment and maintenance of American power in Asia. Under John Kennedy when a mistake was made it was admitted. It was a time of hope. Now when a mistake is made, another is made to cover it.

The following comments were made by Sen. Morse at an afternoon press conference: Congress must exercise the power of the purse. Those letting down the boys in Viet-Nam are those voting the money to kill more and more of them. To save the Democratic Party, you have got to clean it up. It will be charged in history with leading the world into a third world war, unless it changes Johnson's foreign policy. I don't want to sit in the Senate if I have to sit there and vote for Johnson's unconstitutional war. But I am not going to be defeated in 1968. I've got a secret weapon in Oregon. We are second in the nation in literacy. In 1964 I campaigned in 14 states at Johnson's request, defending his foreign policy--"This is a war that should be fought by Asian boys"--against Goldwater. But as soon as Johnson was elected, he proceeded to out-Goldwater Goldwater. I have shocked my Democratic colleagues by telling them on the floor of the Senate: "It's a shame Goldwater wasn't elected. If he had been, the Democratic Party would stand opposed to his war policy. But you have put partisanship ahead of your country."

After the afternoon workshops and the showing of two short films about Hiroshima and Viet-Nam, the evening session got under way. The master of ceremonies was John Henry Faulk, the Texan who was blackballed from the entertainment industry during the McCarthy era, but who fought back to win the largest libel suit in history. The evening speeches by Sen. Morse, Lincoln Lynch of CORE, and Robert Cook are reprinted elsewhere in this newsletter. Between the speeches the SNCC Freedom Singers entertained the crowd.

Ossie Davis concluded the day's activities by relating "black power" to the peace movement. He said that in 1964 the Negro people joined the great consensus that voted for LBJ. Their leaders even asked them not to demonstrate, so as not to rock the boat. But "to our horror the man we voted for because he was for peace has turned out to be a traitor to all we believed in. You must understand the feeling of the Negro people when they realized this. Black power means we will never again be betrayed by anyone's consensus. Integration is a marvelous concept and some of us at the top have had it. But the people in the slums and ghettos have had only outegration. There is a deep-seated fear that our country will become fascist. War has led many countries to fascism. Today we are only one step from fascism. And if fascism comes to this country we know who will be the target--the black man."

# MESSAGE FROM JOHN LEWIS

The war in Vietnam is an evil and vicious war. On this the twenty-first anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima we must use our energy to put an end to this war.

All men of good will must speak out against this war by voting in the coming election for men of peace.

Let us use the funds that are being spent in Vietnam to do away with slums and ghettos of this country and have real war on poverty.

# cook's speech cont.

ing billions of dollars on destruction, while great social needs at home and abroad go unmet.

But there is one particularly insidious aspect of the war -- the way in which it has gradually eroded our

# Lyncoln Lynch August 6 Speech

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, at a time when racists and the warlords of our society are all shouting, ESCALATE, when the might power of the Presidency and the Administration is being used to stifle criticism, prevent debate, and still the voice of protest, it is indeed heartening that there are men and women like yourselves willing and unafraid to let their voices be heard and their faces be seen against this cruel and inhuman war.

We the outcasts, the rejects of society, we the black people of America have a very special interest in this struggle. This land called America was built and made strong on our sweat, our tears, our toil, our blood, it was made great on our miseries and we are now the moral conscience of this Nation. We see this war as the last proof of the duplicity of America's foreign and domestic policy.

I and the Congress of Racial Equality, CORE, which I represent, am happy to have been one of the first to point up the position of the Civil Rights Movement in man's eternal struggle for peace on earth, and the part to be played by the poor Negro ghetto dwellers in the cities and on the farms of our nation. Since that time the matter of the war in Viet-Nam has become a subject of national debate and controversy, involving every segment of our society.... To support such a war as this, one so suffused with conscious racism, is to support the racism on which it feeds. To support a war such as this is to support the use of black taxpayers' money to destroy and subjugate other colored folks. To support this war is to support the use of gas and napalm against an unfortunate people, and I will point out that this so-called "humane form of warfare" wasn't even used against the Nazi beasts.

America has become a Nation of cynical hypocrites, a place where we preach peace, yet, wage war in all its starkest horror. A country where we speak of goodwill and brotherhood, yet from Montauk Point to Lower California, from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico, racism and hate reign supreme.

To those who say this nation is rich enough to afford guns and butter, our answer is: No nation is rich enough to squander its human and material resources in a vain and futile effort to destroy and subjugate an emerging people. This is not only a sign of poverty, it is a sign of moral bankruptcy.... How can Congress, almost without debate, vote fifty-eight billion dollars to support ponderous blood sucking defense machine and haggle like barn-yard hens at two billion dollars for a poverty program for the poor whites and the poor blacks of this nation? Where is their sense of proportion?

Too many of our Negro leaders have abdicated their responsibilities to confusion, and have allowed themselves to fall easy and willing prey to the blandishments of those who would keep them and the Negro masses forever in chains. Long schooled in a paternalistic society, they have placed all their trust and all their faith in the integrity and probity of the white power structure, and the lessons which should long ago have been learnt are monotonous in their instances of deceit and double-dealing. Blinded by the fawnings of the upholders of the status quo, and mesmerised by their own imagined self-importance, they have lost touch with the Negro masses of the ghetto, the slum and the rural farm, and they have failed the wholesale longing for Peace, for human dignity and a better way of life. These leaders have failed to recognize that the ordinary Negro sees this war as a white man's war, a war from which the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, a war in which a black man fights and dies, and his buddy comes home and goes on relief, while his white colleague goes on to college. Our Negro leaders, lacking substance and depth to their own strivings, have been unable to excite these qualities in those around them, and having no clear directions themselves, have led the Negro people into the maze of confusion, and the quicksands of indecision. Who speaks for the Negro? Where is our Moses?

And as often as we ask these questions as often comes back the answer, "who would be free, himself must break the chains". This is the essence and the meaning of the drive for Black Power. If anyone is in any doubt, if the reports of all the news media are not clearly understood, or properly interpreted, especially those of the last few weeks, let me state simply and unequivocally, this is a total struggle, and there are few holds barred. This is a struggle to change the basic structure of American society, to tear down the old institutions and edifices which have shackled black and white alike in the twin chains of poverty and second-class citizenship. But this is a struggle also to rebuild America in the image of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. An America and a world where Peace is the greatest virtue and Human dignity and respect for the individual a lasting reality. That the sons and daughters of black slaves are playing a most important role in this struggle must be one of the greatest paradoxes of all times.

We say to the President, to the government, to the American people; stop this senseless, useless slaughter, this needless, wanton waste of our human and material resources. Bring your sons home. Fight the war against poverty, against hunger, against disease, against ignorance, the real war against racism and inequality in our own land. Let's worry less about saving face, Mr. President, and more about saving lives--human lives. The struggle to end the war in Viet-Nam is an integral part of the civil and human rights struggle here in the U.S., to relieve black people from the bondage of 100 years; and we of CORE have played and will continue to play a major role in this struggle in spite of the detraction of black sycophants. WE SHALL BE FREE. For freedom is our birthright. WE SHALL OVERCOME for on our successes rests this nation's future.

Lincoln Lynch
Congress of Racial Equality

# U.S. – LATIN AMERICA WHAT CAN BE DONE?

by Gilbert W. Merkx

While in the U.S. the average annual income has been increasing at a spectacular rate since the end of the Depression, in Latin America it is just keeping ahead of population growth. Between 1960 and 1962 the U.S. population grew by 6 million people and the U.S. output grew by 53 billion dollars. In the same period in Latin America the population grew by 11 million people but output grew by only 7 billion dollars. As a result, the average personal income in Latin America was a disturbing $370 in 1962 (for the poorest half of Latin Americans it was less than $120 per year). These figures translate into gruesome slums and appalling misery, which are democratically distributed among the 20 Latin American republics. In short, Latin America is staying poor while the U.S. becomes richer. The gap between the haves and the have-nots is growing absolutely and relatively greater, day by day.

The U.S. as an economic system has been playing an important, though hardly beneficial economic role in Latin America. Just as Africa is a major source of raw material and primary products for the industrial centers of Europe, Latin America is still an economic hinterland of the U.S. economy. The U.S. is the chief trade partner of Latin America (about half of Latin America's imports and exports are with the U.S.) and the main source of the capital goods which Latin America needs for economic development. If Latin America is to develop, it must have capital. The position of the U.S. government has been that Latin America should obtain this capital either by 1) earning it through trade or 2) accepting direct private investment from abroad. However, if this position is maintained, Latin America (with the possible exception of one or two countries) will not become a developed area, because the lagging earnings from trade are acting as a bottleneck rather than a stimulant to economic growth and because foreign investment over the long run can withdraw more dollars in than it brings in.

Why have Latin America's earnings from trade not grown more rapidly? Because it is hard to expand the production of raw materials beyond a certain point; because the prices of exports have fallen; and the demand for such products is limited. Thus if Latin America wishes to share in the expanding world markt, it must sell industrial products, not just raw materials, but it cannot industrialize partly because it sells only raw materials.

Private foreign investment does not appear to be a way out of this vicious circle. Even in Canada Ministers of Finance have attacked U.S. direct private investment as ultimately being more costly and dangerous than other forms of investment (N. Y. Times, May 6, 1966). Between 1946 and 1962 U.S. foreign investment, which amounted to around 85% of the total in Latin America, added up to $7.4 billion, while the transfer of income, to the U.S. from Latin America (made on this investment) came to $13.6 billion.

From a Latin American viewpoint, the disturbing fact is that despite all the flow of money out of Latin America, the companies remain in U.S. hands, and will send more money out in the future, while continuing to grow, like some cancerous tissue. U.S. holdings were $2.7 billion in 1943, $4.4 billion in 1950, and $8.1 billion in 1960.

Recognition of the cost of foreign investment does not involve denial of some very real benefits which it brings to the host economy in terms of added economic resources. But the fact remains that other forms of capitalization may be cheaper in the long run for the host country--forms such as loans or domestic private investment. In the Latin American case, it seems clear that the cost of foreign investment is such that it does not provide a means to economic development, contrary to official U.S. thinking of the past and present.

Now, what can be done about this problem? First of all, I would like to suggest that the problem of capitalization of Latin America is a separate problem from that of U.S. intervention in the region. U.S. intervention (whether in the form of sending troops, setting up local armies of occupation in each country, bribing officials and financing electoral candidates, embargoing trade or giving loans to dictators) is essentially a matter of maintaining the social and political status quo. Stopping these interventions would not by itself change the status quo, although it would open the way for change. But even a complete change of the social and political status quo a la Cuba, in every country, would not alter the reality of the economic structure in which Latin America, an underdeveloped, primary-producing region, is dependent upon the wealthy industrial nations for the resources needed to become prosperous.

Unfortunately, it is easier to analyze the nature of the problem than to find a viable solution. My feeling is that consistent long-term efforts should be directed at changing the structure of the international economic order, and that the focus of pressure should be on the centers of power in the industrial nations, because the power to change the situation lies there. A more radical point of view is that the wealthy and powerful are inevitably corrupted by their position, and that the only answer lies in the purification of revolution and, as with China, withdrawal from the world economy.

The problem with this more radical position is the equating of a solution to one type of problem (domestic socio-political change) with the solution to another type of problem (economic development). Revolution may indeed be the only solution to the internal problems of a number of Latin American nations, but a revolutionary government faces the same economic situation that the reactionary government faced the night before. No nation in Latin America, including Brazil, possesses the degree of self-sufficiency or the human and natural resources that Russia and China possessed when they combined revolution with partial isolation. As a result,

Cont. -- Next Page

honor, our integrity, our sense of truth. Three Presidents have said that we could not and would not fight that war with our troops -- yet our troops are now fighting it. We were told that we would not go North, that we would not bomb Hanoi, yet we have done that. We were told that there were no responses to our peace feelers, yet we know that there were. We are told that we are not seeking a military solution, but we are doing just that. We are told we are fighting agression from the North, yet we know that this is a civil war. We are told that ours is a policy of restraint, yet no restraint is evident short of nuclear war.

If this were merely cynical propaganda fed out of Washington, we could dismiss it as part of the game of politics. But the incredible thing is that it seems as though we are supposed to believe it. That our highest officials believe the American people to be so credulous reveals the contempt in which they hold us -- which must extend to include contempt for the democratic process as well.

In other words, they count on us to keep quiet, to acquiesce, to go along. Our job is to refuse! The peculiar thing about democracy is this: that while it allows great individual freedom, it implies equally great individual responsibility for collective decisions. We are here tonight because we accept that responsibility, and because we challenge the decisions that the Johnson administration is making in our name. That's what the "New Politics" is about. But let there be no mistake. Our job has just begun. For to make a real political challenge requires that we become real political animals -- that we devote our lives to the task of wresting power from those who have betrayed us. To make democracy work, we must work at it.

What makes this so difficult is that we have so few examples of responsible men to emulate. Where are those men who can inspire us by their own lifelong commitment to the principles we value?

As a teacher, I searched for models and found men like H. H. Wilson and C. Wright Mills. In the entertainment world, one man who stood up and fought like no other is here tonight -- John Henry Faulk.

In politics, the search is even more difficult. For politics is the art of the possible, marked by compromise. When gross political corruption or incompetence is revealed, the excuse is often that everybody does it; that it is to be expected, that that, after all, is politics. Thus the unethical conduct of my opponent is used to justify the incredible activities of Senator Dodd.

But that excuse is invalid. We know that there are honest men in politics, men whom we can admire because of their integrity, their refusal to sacrifice principle to expediency. They are men who combine a deep concern for their fellow human beings with a thoroughgoing American individualism; who refuse to be bound by rigid ideologies in their pursuit of justice; who are truly independent.

In the face of the national crisis presented by the war in Viet-Nam, a few members of our Congress have spoken out. Fewer still have voted their beliefs. Of these, one man stands out for his courage, for his consistent and continuous fight for law, for peace, for decency, for sanity. It is a pleasure and a great honor to present that man to you tonight -- Senator Wayne Morse.

# senator morse-cont.

it must be justified with a new rationale, and when a rationale takes on the jingoism of defeating communism in Asia before it reaches the American shore, new and more dramatic ventures to do just that are not only made to sound reasonable but are encouraged.

I want to say to my President again tonight, if you continue to lead this Nation down the road to a continually escalating war, you are going to have to assume the responsibility in history for sending American troops to Asia by the millions. . . .

This war cannot be won with military might. The solutions over there are not military solutions, but political solutions. Therefore, we had better give some heed to what steps we should take in an attempt to bring the war to an end, for as Lippmann points out: "Asia must be defended and promoted without America becoming involved in such a land war as is now raging in Viet-Nam."

Most recently, in an interview in U.S. News, General Ky has called for an American invasion of North Viet-Nam as the only alternative to a ten-year war. It is a very sad thing that we are supporting that little tyrant and that American boys are dying to keep him in power.

This is dangerous business. The story that the President told in his trip through Kentucky and Indiana over the last weekend was quite different from the promises he made to the American people in 1964. . . . Millions of Americans of the Republican Party voted for him as they rejected their own party's candidate, because they were led to believe that Lyndon B. Johnson, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, was promising them that he would not follow a foreign policy that would result in American boys fighting a war in Asia that Asian boys should fight.

I am never happy, and I shall never be happy, disagreeing with the policy of my Government in the field of foreign affairs; but I shall continue to disagree with it so long as the policy is the present policy, for that policy is unjustified and immoral. It is not possible to reconcile it on the basis of our international commitments and of our constitutional obligations.

It is not too late for us to return to moral values. It is not too late for this great religious people to insist that their government practice our religious principles in the field of foreign policy, too. And we cannot square this war, in my judgment, with the tenets of our religions.

What should the President do? I repeat, he should announce to the world that we intend to hold those positions that we can hold and completely defend, and prevent the advance of the enemy, and thereby also stop advancing our own boys into an escalated engagement or

Cont. -- Next Page

series of engagements. Because, as we send them out into these battlefields, as we sit in our living rooms and observe some of the television pictures of this war being fought, with its killing, on the television screen, we must ask ourselves, "By what right does our President send those boys to their death?"

I say he has no justifiable right.

The British Prime Minister and the heads of the major countries of the world, including Russia, have a clear obligation, under the United Nations Charter, to enforce a peace in Southeast Asia. We ought to adopt what is known as the enclave approach for the time being, and agree to support a cease-fire, whenever these other nations are willing to declare it, backed up by their pledge that they will help enforce it.

Unless we do that, there will be no peace in Asia. There may be a surrender of a kind, but no peace. And this country will be bled white from the standpoint of the blood of the men who will be sacrificed, and bled white economically, as we spend the billions of dollars that it will take from the people of this country to maintain the police force that we will have to maintain in Asia after our great military power does all the devastating that can be done with nuclear and conventional bombing.

But that, as this administration's military spokesmen knows, will not win a peace in Asia.

I would like to see unity. But there are too many who recognize that a President has no justifiable right to send these boys to their slaughter without a declaration of war, under the Constitution of the United States. And why does he not call for it? He does not dare, not only because any proposal on his part for a declaration of war would not only deepen the disunity in the United States until a declaration is passed -- if it is passed -- but because it would alienate more and more of the countries in the world that we would like to have as our allies. And so, I think the President has a great obligation, in the absence of declaration of war, to announce to the world that we are going to stop the escalating. . . .

I intend to continue to hold to that position until there is a declaration of war, if one comes.

On the basis of the present facts, I would vote against it, but if there is a declaration of war, it is for Congress to do and not the President. He can recommend it.

He ought to read again the war messages of great Presidents before him, and particularly the war message of Woodrow Wilson at the time of World War I, when he said to the joint session of Congress that he was without constitutional authority to make war without congressional declaration of war.

The American people must have a means of expressing themselves on this issue. In state after state, there is no means because there are no alternatives offered. That is why the candidates here are performing a service they probably do not appreciate themselves. They are providing the American people with an opportunity to make themselves heard in support of the position an overwhelming number of them took in November, 1964, when they elected Lyndon Johnson President more on the "peace issue" than on anything else.

I know it is not easy to undertake and to organize a political campaign outside the regular party organization, which many of you are doing. Most professional politicians remain in the mainstream of whatever foreign policy is determined for them by the incumbent Administration. That is why so many who orated in support of the Johnson Viet-Nam policy in 1964 now orate in support of a Goldwater policy, simply because it has been taken over by the Administration. That means that the alternative must be presented in large part outside the framework of the regular party organizations.

I want to express my deep respect for those who are willing to do that. I congratulate you and wish you well.

PLEASE PASS AIM NEWSLETTER ON TO FRIENDS! AND SEND US NEW NAMES FOR THE MAILING LIST!

# HOW "PACIFICATION" WORKS

According to an August 5 news dispatch by AP photographer Horst Faas from Moc Hoa, South Viet-Nam, the South Vietnamese army created early this year a "skull and crossbones" commando force that now numbers 2500 men. They were created for one purpose only -- to terrorize the people into ceasing their support for the Viet Cong. Mr. Faas photographed and described a typical action by the commandos -- the destruction of the village of Can Den by the Cambodian border:

"When the 60 raiders leaped from their helicopters, they quickly found the (Viet Cong) school and weapons center. Most of the villagers ran off into Cambodia. The raiders went into every corner of the village and found a few women huddled in huts with their children. They poked rifles at the women demanding the whereabouts of the village men. Every fowl and animal in sight was killed.

"The commandos set every dwelling in the village on fire. A woman tried to rescue some clothing from a burning house, but a commando grabbed the bundle and threw it back into the flames.

"'These people must remember that supporting the Viet Cong can do them no good,' a member of the expedition said. 'If the Viet Cong think they know what destruction is, let them see what we can do.'

"Americans often serve in an advisory capacity, just as they do with other Vietnamese units, but the Vietnamese give the orders."

# THREE FOR TWO

An anonymous donor has given the Cook campaign a gift of $1000. And this same donor has promised to give 50¢ for every dollar someone else contributes to the campaign for the next $3000 contributed. Inflation may have made your money worth less everywhere else, but in the Cook campaign each dollar pays for thirty 5¢ stamps. Make checks payable to the Independent Political Action Committee.

# WE'RE HUMAN TOO WELFARE MARCH

Another step in the fight to improve the inadequate and degrading state welfare system will come in Hartford August 25, when two New Haven poor peoples' groups will join other welfare recipients and poor people and their supporters from all over Connecticut in a march on the state welfare commissioner's office. AIM will join the local groups as a supporting organization.

As in the July march on the New Haven welfare office which AIM co-sponsored, basic demands of the welfare recipients are for realistic living allowances and treatment as human beings. The marchers deny that America's inability to fit them into its economic structure gives it a right to treat them as criminals or dead-beats. The list of the marchers' demands is headlined "WE'RE HUMAN TOO!"

The Hill Parents Association and New Haven CORE are the sponsoring organizations in New Haven. AIM will join church and civil rights groups as supporters. Everyone is invited to contact one of the sponsoring groups to sign petitions which will be presented with the demands.

The text of the march leaflet:

People on state welfare are people the same as anyone else. We need to eat and sleep and keep warm and send our kids to school. We shouldn't be punished for living on welfare. We should live decently too.

We demand that state welfare:

**Pay people enough to live on. A family of four should get $6000 per year. The U.S. Labor Dept. says that is needed to live decently.

If we had enough money to live decently we could manage our own budgets and not have caseworkers deciding every little thing about our lives, like whether our kids can have haircuts or school clothes. Being on welfare is not a crime and caseworkers aren't cops.

**Stop investigations which nose into peoples' lives. Take peoples' word for their need as proposed in New York.

**Some caseworkers don't care about people on welfare. They make us feel like money is coming out of their own pockets.

--neighborhood welfare boards made up of poor people should control welfare money in their areas.

--poor people should be hired as welfare caseworkers. There should be Puerto Rican workers and more black workers.

**Publish a booklet of welfare regulations and allowances and give it to everyone on welfare. We should know what our rights are and what we can get money for.

**Stop unannounced visits and midnight raids. This is already a state welfare dept. rule, but like many of the state's rules, it is not enforced.

**The welfare system makes it almost impossible to get off once you're on.

--people who work should be able to keep what they make.

--welfare people should get first chance at city and state jobs.

--people on welfare shouldn't have to get rid of all property.

**City welfare should be combined with state. People should be able to get to one office and get whatever kind of help they need. We shouldn't be sent back and forth between two offices who never agree with each other. The state should have emergency money.

**Stop paying state money to rent-gouging slumlords.

Many welfare caseworkers in New Haven signed petitions agreeing with the demands of this march. We also support their demands for lower caseloads, increased salaries, and better working conditions.

# u.s.-latin america cont.

every Latin American government interested in economic development must strike a bargain with an industrial nation or nations. The classic example of this is the Cuban experience. Indeed, the best guarantee of successful revolutions is the prior improvement of the international economic order to the benefit of the underdeveloped nations.

The development of Latin America does not therefore present an issue of reform versus revolution, but is rather a matter of reform of the international economic order combined with internal revolution or reform (the only equivalent of revolution in international economics is war). As U.S. citizens, we have no right to make revolutions in other people's lands, but we certainly have the responsibility to help reform an international situation in which we are directly involved.

To be specific, I would like to suggest the following concrete measures with which to begin the reform of U.S.-Latin American economic ties. Achievement of these measures is possible within the U.S. political system, if sufficient pressure can be applied to our policy-makers.

1. Formal and explicit adoption of a non-intervention policy, so that the U.S. will no longer maintain the status quo of domestic social-political orders in Latin America, including:

a) Cessation of the Military Assistance Program;

b) Removal of the Central Intelligence Agency from the region;

c) Adoption of the Estrada Doctrine (permanent diplomatic recognition of all nations, regardless of government);

d) Cessation of trade embargoes;

e) Renunciation of the use of military and naval force.

2. Set up a federal Foreign Investment Commission with the power to

Continued, page 8

## u.s.-latin america

regulate and encourage or prohibit specified types of U.S. investment in Latin America, in cooperation with the Central American and Latin American Common Markets and the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America.

3. Establishment of parity levels (fair price terms of buying-power) for Latin American exports to the U.S. Any lowering in the terms of trade would then result in compensatory payments by the U.S. to Latin America, instead of having the latter bear the brunt as at present.

4. Make alternative sources of capital available to Latin American planners, by funding massive loan programs through a series of competing international agencies (the administration of these funds should not be in U.S. hands, for a variety of reasons) such as:

a) The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;

b) The Inter-American Development Bank;

c) The United Nations Economic Committee for Latin America;

d) An internationalized version of the Export-Import Bank.

5. Commitment by the U.S. government to the eventual repatriation of U.S. direct private investment in Latin America, and the assistance by the U.S. in funding the transfer of ownership to Latin American hands.

## BUY MISSISSIPPI

Beautiful hand-crafted items made in Mississippi cooperatives are now on sale at two New Haven stores. Co-op workers are those people who have suffered economic reprisals as a result of their civil rights activity, unemployed or underemployed farmers and sharecroppers, and those who on strike against intolerable working conditions. Hats and bags are available at the I. J. Miller Shoe Store, 988 Chapel St., 624-9888. Coin pouches are on sale at the Greenwich Village of New Haven, 278 College St., 624-4262.

REMEMBER TO REGISTER TO VOTE!

# AIM

Independent Political Action Committee
241 Orange Street
New Haven
Connecticut

STOP BULLETS WITH BALLOTS!